arXiv:1111.1843v1 [math.CO] 8 Nov 2011

A sufficient condition for the hamiltonian property of digraphs with large semi-degrees

S. Kh. Darbinyan
Institute for Informatics and Automation Problems
Armenian National Academy of Sciences, P. Sevak 1, Yerevan 0014, Armenia
e-mail: samdarbin@ipia.sci.am

Abstract

Let D be a digraph on $p \geq 5$ vertices with minimum degree at least $p-1$ and with minimum semi-degree at least $p/2-1$. For D (unless some extremal cases) we present a detailed proof of the following results [12]: (i) D contains cycles of length 3, 4 and $p-1$; (ii) if $p=2n$, then D is hamiltonian.

Keywords: Digraphs; semi-degrees; cycles; Hamiltonian cycles

1. Introduction and Terminology

Ghouila-Houri [18] proved that every strong digraph on p vertices and with minimum degree at least p is hamiltonian. There are many extentions of this theorem for digraphs and orgraphs. In particular, in many papers, various degree conditions have been obtained for digraphs (orgraphs) to be hamiltonian or pancyclic or vertex pancyclic (see e.g. [2]-[33]). C. Thomassen [31] proved that any digraph on $p=2n+1$ vertices with minimum semi-degree at least n is hamiltonian unless some extremal cases, which are characterized. In [9], we proved that if a digraph D on $2n+1$ vertices satisfies the conditions of this Tomassen's theorem, then D also is pancyclic (the extremal cases are characterized). For additional information on hamiltonian and pancyclic digraphs, see the book [1] by J. Bang-Jenssen and G. Gutin.

In this paper we present a detailed proof of the following results.

Every digraph D (unless some extremal cases) on $p \geq 5$ vertices with minimum degree at least $p-1$ and with minimum semi-degree at least $p/2-1$: (i) D has cycles of length 3, 4 and $p-1$; (ii) if $p=2n$, then D is hamiltonian (in [12], we gave only a short outline of the proofs of this results).

In this paper we will consider finite digraphs without loops and multiple arcs. We denote the vertex set of digraph D by $V(D)$ and its arc set by $A(D)$. We will often use D instead of $A(D)$ and $V(D)$. The arc from a vertex x to a vertex y will be denoted by xy. If xy is an arc, then we say that x dominates y (or y is dominated by x). For A, $B \subset V(D)$, we define $A(A \rightarrow B)$ as the set $\{xy \in A(D)/x \in A, y \in B\}$ and $A(A,B) = A(A \rightarrow B) \cup A(B \rightarrow A)$. If $x \in V(D)$ and $A = \{x\}$, we often write x instead of $\{x\}$. For disjoint subsets A and B of $V(D)$, $A \rightarrow B$ means that every vertex of A dominates every vertex of B. If $C \subset V(D)$, $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow C$, then we write $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$. The outset of vertex x is the set $O(x) = \{y \in V(D)/xy \in A(D)\}$ and $I(x) = \{y \in V(D)/yx \in A(D)\}$ is the inset of x. Similarly, if $A \subseteq V(D)$ then $O(x,A) = \{y \in A/xy \in A(D)\}$ and $I(x,A) = \{y \in A/yx \in A(D)\}$. The out-degree of x is $od(x) = |O(x)|$ and $id(x) = |I(x)|$ is the in-degree of x. Similarly, $od(x,A) = |O(x,A)|$ and $id(x,A) = |I(x,A)|$. The degree of the vertex x in D is defined as $d(x) = id(x) + od(x)$. The subdigraph of D induced by a subset A of $V(D)$ is denoted by $\langle A \rangle$. All paths and cycles we consider in this paper are directed and simple. The path (respectively, the cycle) consisting of distinct vertices $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$ ($n \geq 2$) and arcs x_ix_{i+1}, $i \in [1, n-1]$ (respectively, x_ix_{i+1}, $i \in [1, n-1]$, and x_nx_1), is denoted by $x_1x_2 \ldots x_n$ (respectively, $x_1x_2 \ldots x_nx_1$). The cycle on k vertices is denoted C_k. For a cycle $C_k = x_1x_2 \ldots x_kx_1$, we take the indices modulo k, i.e., $x_s = x_i$ for every s and i such that $i \equiv s \bmod k$.

Two distinct vertices x and y are adjacent if $xy \in A(D)$ or $yx \in A(D)$ (or both) (i.e, x is adjacent with y and y is adjacent with x). The notation $A(x,y) \neq \emptyset$ (respectively, $A(x,y) = \emptyset$) means that the vertices x and y are adjacent (respectively, are not adjacent).

The converse digraph $\overleftarrow{D}$ of a digraph D is the digraph obtained from D by reversing all arcs of D.

For an undirected graph G, we denote by G^* symmetric digraph obtained from G by replacing every edge xy with the pair xy, yx of arcs. Further, $C^*(5)$ is a symmetric digraph obtained from undirected cycle of length 5. K_n (respectively, $K_{n,m}$) denotes the complete undirected graph on n vertices (respectively, undirected complete bipartite graph, with partite sets of cardinalities n and m), and $\overline{K}_n$ denotes the complement of K_n. If G_1 and G_2 are undirected graphs, then $G_1 \cup G_2$ is the disjoint union of G_1 and G_2. The join of G_1 and G_2, denoted by $G_1 + G_2$, is the union of $G_1 \cup G_2$ and of all the edges between G_1 and G_2.

For integers a and b, let $[a,b]$ denote the set of all integers which are not less than a and are not greater than b. We refer the reader to J.Bang-Jensens and G.Gutin's book [1] for notations and terminology not defined here.

2. Preliminaries and Additional notations

Let us recall some well-known lemmas used in this paper.

Lemma 1 ([21]). Let D be a digraph on $p \geq 3$ vertices containing a cycle C_m, $m \in [2, p-1]$. Let x be a vertex not contained in this cycle. If $d(x, C_m) \geq m+1$, then D contains a cycle C_k for all $k \in [2, m+1]$. $\square$

The following Lemma will be used extensively in the proofs our results.

Lemma 2 ([6]). Let D be a digraph on $p \geq 3$ vertices containing a path $P := x_1x_2 \ldots x_m$, $m \in [2, p-1]$ and let x be a vertex not contained in this path. If one of the following holds:

(i) $d(x, P) \geq m+2$;

(ii) $d(x, P) \geq m+1$ and $xx_1 \notin D$ or $x_mx_1 \notin D$;

(iii) $d(x, P) \geq m$, $xx_1 \notin D$ and $x_mx \notin D$;

then there is an $i \in [1, m-1]$ such that $x_ix, xx_{i+1} \in D$, i.e., D contains a path $x_1x_2 \ldots x_ixx_{i+1} \ldots x_m$ of length m (we say that x can be inserted into P or the path $x_1x_2 \ldots x_ixx_{i+1} \ldots x_m$ is extended from P with x). $\square$

As an immediate consequence of Lemma 2, we get the following:

Lemma 3. Let D be a digraph on $p \geq 4$ vertices and let $P := x_1x_2 \ldots x_m$, $m \in [2, p-2]$, be a path of maximal length from x_1 to x_m in D. If the induced subdigraph $\langle V(D) \setminus V(P) \rangle$ is strong and $d(x, V(P)) = m+1$ for every vertex $x \in V(D) \setminus V(P)$, then there is an integer $l \in [1, m]$ such that $O(x, V(P)) = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_l\}$ and $I(x, V(P)) = \{x_l, x_{l+1}, \ldots, x_m\}$. $\square$

Now we introduce the following notations.

Notation. For any positive integer n, let $H(n,n)$ denote the set of digraphs D on $2n$ vertices such that $V(D) = A \cup B$, $\langle A \rangle \equiv \langle B \rangle \equiv K_n^*$, $A(B \to A) = \emptyset$ and for every vertex $x \in A$ (respectively, $y \in B$) $A(x \to B) \neq \emptyset$ (respectively, $A(A \to y) \neq \emptyset$).

Notation. For any integer $n \geq 2$, let $H(n, n-1, 1)$ denote the set of digraphs D on $2n$ vertices such that $V(D) = A \cup B \cup \{a\}$, $|A| = |B| + 1 = n$, $A(\langle A \rangle) = \emptyset$, $\langle B \cup \{a\} \rangle \subseteq K_n^*$, yz, $zy \in D$ for each pair of vertices $y \in A$, $z \in B$ and either $I(a) = B$ and $a \to A$ or $O(a) = B$ and $A \to a$.

Notation. For any integer $n \geq 2$ define the digraph $H(2n)$ as follows: $V(H(2n)) = A \cup B \cup \{x, y\}$, $\langle A \rangle \equiv \langle B \rangle \equiv K^*_{n-1}$, $A(A, B) = \emptyset$, $O(x) = \{y\} \cup A$, $I(x) = O(y) = A \cup B$ and $I(y) = \{x\} \cup B$.

$H'(2n)$ is a digraph obtained from $H(2n)$ by adding the arc yx.

Notation. Let D_6 be a digraph with vertex set $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_5, x\}$ and arc set

$$\{x_i x_{i+1} \,/ 1 \leq i \leq 4\} \cup \{x x_i / \, 1 \leq i \leq 3\} \cup \{x_1 x_5, x_2 x_5, x_5 x_1, x_5 x_4, x_3 x_2, x_3 x, x_4 x_1, x_4 x\}.$$

By D'_6 we denote a digraph obtained from D_6 by adding the arc $x_2 x_4$.

Note that the digraphs D_6 and D'_6 both are not hamiltonian and each of D_6 and D'_6 contains a cycle of length 5.

Lemma 4. Let D be a digraph on $p \geq 3$ vertices with minimum degree at least $p-1$ and with minimum semi-degree at least $p/2 - 1$. Then

(i) either D is strong or $D \in H(n, n)$;

(ii) if $B \subset V(D)$, $|B| \geq (p+1)/2$ and $x \in V(D) \setminus B$, then $A(x \to B) \neq \emptyset$ and $A(B \to x) \neq \emptyset$. $\square$

3. A sufficient condition for the existence of cycles of length $|V(D)| - 1$ in digraph D

Theorem 1. Let D be a digraph on $p \geq 5$ vertices with minimum degree at least $p-1$ and with minimum semi-degree at least $p/2 - 1$. Then D has a cycle of length $p - 1$ unless

$$D \in H(n, n) \cup \{[(K_n \cup K_n) + K_1]^*, H(2n), H'(2n), C^*(5)\} \quad \text{or else} \quad p = 2n \quad \text{and} \quad D \subseteq K^*_{n,n}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4(i), the result is easily verified if D is not strong. Assume that D is strong. Suppose, on the contrary, that the theorem is not true. In particular, D contains no cycle of length $p - 1$. Let $C := C_m := x_1 x_2 \dots x_m x_1$ be an arbitrary non-hamiltonian cycle of maximum length in D. It is easy to see that $m \in [3, p-2]$.

From Lemma 1 and the maximality of m it follows that for each vertex $y \in B := V(D) \setminus V(C)$ and for each $i \in [1, m]$,

$$d(y, C) \leq m, \quad d(y, B) \geq p - m - 1 \quad \text{and if} \quad x_i y \in D, \quad \text{then} \quad y x_{i+1} \notin D. \tag{1}$$

Using $d(y, B) \geq p - m - 1$ it is not difficult to show the following claim:

Claim 1. For any two distinct vertices $x, y \in B$ if in subdigraph $\langle B \rangle$ there is no path from x to y, then in $\langle B \rangle$ there is a path from y to x of length at most 2. $\square$

We first prove the following Claims 2 and 3.

Claim 2. The induced subdigraph $\langle B \rangle$ is strongly connected.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $\langle B \rangle$ is not strong. Let $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_s$ $(s \geq 2)$ be the strong components of $\langle B \rangle$ labeled in such a way that no vertex of D_i dominates a vertex of D_j whenever $i > j$. From Claim 1 it follows that for each pair of vertices $y \in V(D_1)$ and $z \in V(D_s)$ in $\langle B \rangle$ there is a path from y to z of length 1 or 2. We choose the vertices $y \in V(D_1)$ and $z \in V(D_s)$ such that the path $y_1 y_2 \dots y_k$, where $y_1 := y$ and $y_k := z$, will have minimum length among all paths in $\langle B \rangle$ with origin vertex in D_1 and terminus vertex in D_s. By Claim 1, $k = 2$ or $k = 3$. We consider the following tree cases.

Case 1. $k < |B| = p - m$.

It follows from the maximality of C that if $x_i y_1 \in D$, where $i \in [1, m]$, then $A(y_k \to \{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \ldots, x_{i+k}\}) = \emptyset$. Since D is strong, we see that $C \not\subseteq I(y_1)$. Therefore the vertex y_k dose not dominate at least $id(y_1, C) + 1$ vertices of C. On the other hand, we have $A(y_k \to V(D_1)) = \emptyset$ and $I(y_1) \subset C \cup V(D_1)$. Hence the vertex y_k dose not dominate at least $id(y_1) + 3$ vertices. From this we obtain $od(y_k) \leq p - id(y_1) - 3 \leq p/2 - 2$, which is a contradiction.

Case 2. $k = |B| = 2$.

It is easy to see that $s = 2$, $m = p - 2$, $V(D_1) = \{y_1\}$, $V(D_2) = \{y_2\}$, $I(y_1) \subset C$ and

$$|A(x_i \to y_1)| + |A(y_2 \to x_{i+2})| \leq 1$$

for all $i \in [1, m]$. Hence the vertex y_2 dose not dominate at least $id(y_1) + 2$ vertices. Therefore $od(y_2) \leq p - id(y_1) - 2 \leq p/2 - 1$. It follows that $p = 2n$, $id(y_1) = od(y_2) = n - 1$ and

$$y_2 x_i \in D \quad \text{if and only if} \quad x_{i-2} y_1 \notin D. \tag{2}$$

By Lemma 1, it is easy to see that $d(y_1) = d(y_2) = 2n - 1$ and $od(y_1) = id(y_2) = n$, $m \geq 4$. Now we divide this case into two subcases.

Subcase 2.1. $y_1 \to \{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$ for some $i \in [1, m]$.

Note that, by Lemma 2, without loss of generality, we may assume that $x_m y_1 \in D$, $y_1 \to \{x_2, x_3\}$ and $A(x_1, y_1) = \emptyset$. From this, (1) and (2) it follows that $x_2 y_1 \notin D$, $y_2 x_3$, $y_2 x_4 \in D$ and $A(x_2, y_2) = \emptyset$. Therefore, by Lemma 2 we have $x_1 y_2 \in D$ since $d(y_2, C) = 2n - 2$ and the vertex y_2 cannot be inserted into the path $x_3 x_4 \ldots x_m x_1$. If $x_2 x_1 \in D$, then $C_{2n-1} = x_m y_1 x_2 x_1 y_2 x_4 \ldots x_m$. This contradicts our supposition that D contains no cycle of length $p - 1$. Hence, $x_2 x_1 \notin D$. From this and $A(x_2, y_2) = A(x_2 \to y_1) = \emptyset$ it follows that $d(x_2, \{x_3, x_4, \ldots, x_m\}) \geq 2n - 3$. Therefore by Lemma 2, $x_m x_2 \in D$ since the vertex x_2 cannot be inserted into the path $x_3 x_4 \ldots x_m$. Now it is easy to see that $|A(x_i \to y_1)| + |A(y_2 \to x_{i+1})| \leq 1$ for all $i \in [2, m-1]$. Therefore $x_3 y_1 \notin D$ since $y_2 x_4 \in D$. From this and (2) it follows that $y_2 x_5 \in D$ and $x_4 y_1 \notin D$. Continuing in this manner, we obtain that $A(\{x_5, x_6, \ldots, x_{m-1}\} \to y_1) = \emptyset$. Therefore $A(\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{m-1}\} \to y_1) = \emptyset$, which is a contradiction.

Subcase 2.2. $|A(y_1 \to \{x_i, x_{i+1}\})| \leq 1$ for all $i \in [1, m]$.

Since $od(y_1) = n$, we can assume that $O(y_1) = \{x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{2n-3}, y_2\}$. Using this and $od(y_2) = id(y_1) = n - 1$, we obtain $I(y_1) = \{x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{2n-3}\}$. Therefore by (2),

$$O(y_2) = \{x_2, x_4, \ldots, x_{2n-2}\} \quad \text{and} \quad I(y_2) = \{y_1, x_2, x_4, \ldots, x_{2n-2}\}.$$

If $x_i x_j \in D$ for distinct vertices $x_i, x_j \in \{x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{2n-3}\}$, then $C_{2n-1} = y_1 x_i x_j x_{j+1} \ldots x_{i-1} y_2 x_{i+1} \ldots x_{j-2} y_1$, when $|\{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \ldots, x_{j-1}\}| \geq 2$ and $C_{2n-1} = x_i x_j y_1 y_2 x_{j+1} x_{j+2} \ldots x_{i-1} x_i$, when $|\{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \ldots, x_{j-1}\}| = 1$. This contradicts that $C_{p-1} \not\subset D$. Thus we have

$$A(\langle \{x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{2n-3}, y_2\} \rangle) = \emptyset.$$

Considering the digraph $\overleftarrow{D}$, by the same arguments we obtain

$$A(\langle \{x_2, x_4, \ldots, x_{2n-2}, y_1\} \rangle) = \emptyset.$$

Therefore $D \subseteq K^*_{n,n}$, which contradicts our supposition that the theorem is not true.

Case 3. $k =\mid B \mid= 3$.

From the minimality of k it follows that $y_1y_3 \notin D$, $s = 3$, $A(\{y_2, y_3\} \to y_1) = \emptyset$ and $V(D_1) = \{y_1\}$. Hence $I(y_1) \subset C$. On the other hand, from the maximality of the cycle C it follows that for each $i \in [1, m]$

$$\text{if} \quad x_iy_1 \in D, \quad \text{then} \quad A(y_2 \to \{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}\}) = \emptyset.$$

Therefore y_2 dose not dominate at least $id(y_1) + 3$ vertices, a contradiction. Claim 2 is proved. □

Claim 3. At least two distinct vertices of C are adjacent with some vertices of B.
Proof. Assume that Claim 3 is not true. Then exactly one vertex, say x, of C is adjacent with some vertices of B. Hence for each vertex $x_i \in C \setminus \{x\}$ and for each vertex $y \in B$ we have

$$d(x_i) = d(x_i, C) \leq 2m - 2 \quad \text{and} \quad d(y) = d(y, B) + d(y, x) \leq 2p - 2m.$$

Since $d(x_i) + d(y) \geq 2p - 2$, we conclude that the inequalities above are equalities. This implies that the subdigraphs $\langle C\rangle$ and $\langle B \cup \{x\}\rangle$ are complete. From $d(x_i) = 2m - 2 \geq p - 1$ and $d(y) = 2p - 2m \geq p - 1$, we obtain that $p = 2m - 1$. Therefore $G \equiv [(K_{m-1} \cup K_{m-1}) + K_1]^*$, which contradicts our supposition. This proves Claim 3. □

Since D is strong, then $A(C \to B) \neq \emptyset$ and $A(B \to C) \neq \emptyset$. Together with Claim 3 this implies that there are vertices $x_a \neq x_b$, $x_a, x_b \in C$ and $x, y \in B$ such that x_ax, $yx_b \in D$ and

$$A(\{x_{a+1}, x_{a+2}, \dots, x_{b-1}\}, B) = \emptyset, \quad \text{if} \quad x_b \neq x_{a+1}. \tag{3}$$

To be definite, assume that $x_b := x_1$ and $x_a := x_{m-h}$ $(0 \leq h \leq m-2)$. We consider the following two cases.

Case 1. $x_{m-h+1} \neq x_1$ (i.e., $h \geq 1$).

Consider the paths P_0, P_1, ..., P_k $(0 \leq k \leq h$ and k is as maximum as possible), where $P := P_0 := x_1x_2 \dots x_{m-h}$ and the path P_i, $i \in [1, k]$, is extended from the path P_{i-1} with a vertex $z_i \in \{x_{m-h+1}, x_{m-h+2}, \dots, x_m\} \setminus \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{i-1}\}$. Note that the path P_i, $i \in [0, k]$, contains $m - h + i$ vertices. It follows that some vertices $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_d \in \{x_{m-h+1}, x_{m-h+2}, \dots, x_m\}$, where $1 \leq d \leq h$, dose not containing the extended path P_k. Therefore, using (3) and Lemma 2, for each $z \in B$ and for each y_i we obtain

$$d(z) = d(z, B) + d(z, C) \leq 2p - 2m - 2 + m - h + 1 = 2p - m - h - 1$$

and

$$d(y_i) = d(y_i, C) \leq m + d - 1.$$

Hence it is clear that

$$2p - 2 \leq d(z) + d(y_i) \leq 2p + d - h - 2.$$

It is not difficult to see that $h = d$, $d(z, C) = m - h + 1$, $d(y_i, C) = m + h - 1$ and the subdigraphs $\langle B\rangle$ and $\langle\{x_{m-h+1}, x_{m-h+2}, \dots, x_m\}\rangle$ are complete. By Lemma 2(ii), we also have $x_{m-h} \to B \cup \{x_{m-h+1}, x_{m-h+2}, \dots, x_m\} \to x_1$. It is easy to see that $h = |B| = p - m \geq 2$ and the path $P = x_1x_2 \dots x_{m-h}$ has maximum length among all paths from x_1 to x_{m-h} in subdigraph $\langle C\rangle$ and in subdigraph $\langle B \cup \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{m-h}\}\rangle$. Therefore by Lemma 3, there are integers $l \in [1, m - h]$ and $r \in [1, m - h]$ such that

$$O(u, P) = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l\}, \quad I(u, P) = \{x_l, x_{l+1}, \dots, x_{m-h}\},$$

$$O(z, P) = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r\}, \quad I(z, P) = \{x_r, x_{r+1}, \dots, x_{m-h}\}. \tag{4}$$

for all $u \in B$ and for all $z \in \{x_{m-h+1}, x_{m-h+2}, \dots, x_m\}$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $l \leq r$ (otherwise we will consider the digraph $\overleftarrow{D}$).

Let $l = 1$. Then from $od(u) \geq p/2-1$ and (4) it follows that $h \geq p/2-1$ and $p \geq 2(p/2-1)+m-h = p-2+m-h$. Since $m-h \geq 2$, we see that $p = 2n$, $m-h = 2$, $h = n-1$ and $r = 2$. Therefore $G \in \{H(2n), H'(2n)\}$, which contradicts the our supposition.

Let now $l \geq 2$. We can assume that $r \leq m-h-1$ (otherwise in digraph $\overleftarrow{D}$ we will have the considered case $l = 1$). Since $\langle\{x_{m-h+1}, x_{m-h+2}, \ldots, x_m\}\rangle$ are complete and (4), for each vertex $z \in \{x_{m-h+1}, x_{m-h+2}, \ldots, x_m\}$ we have $I(z) = \{x_r, x_{r+1}, \ldots, x_m\} \setminus \{z\}$. This implies that $m-r \geq p/2-1$. If $i \in [r+1, m-h]$ and $x_1x_i \in D$ then by (4) and $2 \leq l \leq r \leq m-h-1$ we have $C_{m+1} = x_1x_ix_{i+1}\ldots x_mx_2\ldots x_{i-1}xx_1$, where $x \in B$, a contradiction. Because of this and $2 \leq l \leq r$, we may assume that

$$A(x_1 \to B \cup \{x_{r+1}, x_{r+2}, \ldots, x_m\}) = \emptyset.$$

Therefore, since $m-r \geq p/2-1$ and $|B| = h \geq 2$, we obtain $od(x_1) \leq p-1-h-(m-r) \leq p/2-h$, which contradicts the condition that $od(x_1) \geq p/2-1$.

Case 2. $x_{m-h+1} = x_1$ (i.e., $h = 0$).

Then any path from x to y in $\langle B\rangle$ is a hamiltonian path. Let $u_1u_2\ldots u_{p-m}$ be a hamiltonian path in $\langle B\rangle$, where $u_1 := x$, $u_{p-m} := y$. From this, if $1 \leq i < j \leq p-m$, then $u_iu_j \in D$ if and only if $j = i+1$.

For this case ($h = 0$) we first prove Claims 4-9.

Claim 4. $p-m = 2$ (i.e., $m = p-2$).
Proof. Suppose, to the contrary, that $p-m \geq 3$. It follows from observations above that $u_1u_{p-m} \notin D$ and $od(u_1, B) = id(u_{p-m}, B) = 1$. From this and (1), we obtain

$$p-1 \leq d(u_1) \leq m+1+id(u_1, B) \quad \text{and} \quad p-1 \leq d(u_{p-m}) \leq m+1+od(u_{p-m}, B).$$

This implies that $id(u_1, B)$ and $od(u_{p-m}, B) \geq p-m-2$. Therefore in $\langle B\rangle$ there is a path from u_{p-m} to u_1 of length $k = 1$ or $k = 2$ since $p-m \geq 3$. For any integer $l \geq 1$, put

$$I_l^+ := \{x_j / \, x_{j-l}u_{p-m} \in D\}.$$

Since $id(u_{p-m}, C) = id(u_{p-m}) - 1$ and $C \nsubseteq I(u_{p-m})$, we see that for each $l \in [1, 2]$,

$$|I_l^+ \cup I_{l+1}^+| \geq id(u_{p-m}).$$

From the maximality of the cycle C it follows that $A(u_1 \to I_k^+ \cup I_{k+1}^+) = \emptyset$. Together with $A(u_1 \to \{u_3, u_4, \ldots, u_{p-m}\}) = \emptyset$ this implies that

$$p/2-1 \leq od(u_1) \leq p-1-|I_k^+ \cup I_{k+1}^+| - (p-m-2) \leq m+1-id(u_{p-m}) \leq m+1-p/2+1.$$

Therefore, since $m \leq p-3$, we obtain that $p-m = 3$, $p = 2n$ and $od(u_1) = id(u_3) = n-1$. Hence, $id(u_1)$ and $od(u_3) \geq n$. We now claim that u_3u_1 and $u_2u_1 \in D$. Indeed, otherwise $id(u_1, C) \geq n-1$ and if $x_iu_1 \in D$, then $A(u_3 \to \{x_{i+2}, x_{i+3}\}) = \emptyset$. From this it is not difficult to see that $od(u_3) \leq n-1$, which contradicts the fact that $od(u_3) \geq n$.

Similarly, we can see that $u_3u_2 \in D$. So we have u_3u_1, u_2u_1, $u_3u_2 \in D$. Then, since $id(u_3, C) = n-2$, $m \geq n$, $m \geq id(u_3, C)+2$ and C is a non-hamiltonian cycle of maximal length, it follows that $|\cup_{i=1}^3 I_i^+| \geq n$ and $A(u_1 \to \cup_{i=1}^3 I_i^+) = \emptyset$. Together with $u_1u_3 \notin D$ this implies that $od(u_1) \leq n-2$, a contradiction. This completes the proof of Claim 4. □

Note that, by Claims 4 and 2 we have $m = p-2$, $B := \{u, v\}$ and uv, $vu \in D$.

Remark. By symmetry of the vertices u and v, Claims 5-9 are also true for the vertex v.

Claim 5. If x_iu, $ux_{i+2} \in D$, $i \in [1,m]$, then $|A(x_{i+1},v)| = 2$ (i.e., $x_{i+1}v$ and $vx_{i+1} \in D$).
Proof. Since the cycle $x_iux_{i+2}x_{i+3}\ldots x_i$ has length m and the vertices v and x_{i+1} are not on this cycle, the subdigraph $\langle\{v,x_{i+1}\}\rangle$ is strong by Claim 2. Therefore vx_{i+1} and $x_{i+1}v \in D$. $\square$

From Claim 5, uv, $vu \in D$ and the maximality of the cycle C we have the following:

Claim 6. If $i \in [1,m]$, then

$$|A(\{x_i,x_{i+1}\} \to u)| + |A(u \to x_{i+3})| \leq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad |A(x_{i-2} \to u)| + |A(u \to \{x_i,x_{i+1}\})| \leq 2.$$

Claim 7. If $k \in [1,m]$, then $|A(\{x_{k-1},x_k\} \to u)| \leq 1$.
Proof. Suppose, to the contrary, that is $k \in [1,m]$ and $\{x_{k-1},x_k\} \to u$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $A(u,x_{k+1}) = \emptyset$. To be definite, assume that $x_{k+2} := x_1$ and $x_m := x_{k+1}$. Then $ux_1 \notin D$ by Claim 6.

First suppose that $x_1u \in D$. It is easy to see that $p \geq 6$ and $A(u \to \{x_{m-1},x_m,x_1,x_2\}) = \emptyset$. Using this together with $od(u) \geq p/2-1$ we see that $A(u \to \{x_3,x_4,\ldots,x_{m-2}\}) \neq \emptyset$ and $d(u,\{x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_{m-1}\}) \geq p-3$. Note that $m \geq 6$ and show that for each $j \in [3,m-3]$,

$$|A(u \to \{x_j,x_{j+1}\}| \leq 1. \tag{5}$$

Assume that (5) is not true. Then $u \to \{x_j,x_{j+1}\}$ for some $j \in [3,m-3]$. We can assume that j is as small as possible. Then $A(u,x_{j-1}) = \emptyset$ and $x_{j-2}u \notin D$ by Claim 6. Hence $j \geq 4$. Since the vertex u cannot be inserted into the cycle C, $ux_1 \notin D$ and $x_{j-2}u \notin D$, by Lemma 2 we have

$$d(u,\{x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_{j-2}\}) \leq j-3 \quad \text{and} \quad d(u,\{x_j,x_{j+1},\ldots,x_{m-1}\}) \leq m-j+1.$$

Hence $d(u) \leq p-2$, a contradiction, which proves (5).

From $A(u \to \{x_{m-1},x_m,x_1,x_2\}) = \emptyset$ and (5) it follows that $od(u) \leq p/2-2$, a contradiction.

So suppose next that $x_1u \notin D$. Then $A(u,x_1) = \emptyset$ by Claim 6, $m \geq 4$ and $d(u,\{x_2,x_3,\ldots,x_{m-1}\}) \geq p-3$. Hence, $ux_2 \in D$ by Lemma 2(ii). Note that $A(v,x_m) = \emptyset$ and $vx_1 \notin D$. By Lemma 2(iii), it is easy to see that $x_{m-1}v \in D$ and $d(v,\{x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_{m-1}\}) = p-3$. If $x_1v \notin D$, then $A(v,x_1) = \emptyset$, and by Lemma 2, $vx_2 \in D$. Now we have $x_{m-1}u, vx_2 \in D$ and $A(\{u,v\},\{x_m,x_1\}) = \emptyset$, and the considered Case 1 ($h \geq 1$) holds. So we may assume that this is not the case. Then $x_1v \in D$. We also can assume that $x_{m-2}v \notin D$ (otherwise $\{x_{m-2},x_{m-1},x_1\} \to v$ and for the vertex v the considered case $x_1u \in D$ holds). From $x_{m-2}v \notin D$ and $vx_1 \notin D$, by Lemma 2(iii), it follows that $d(v,\{x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_{m-2}\}) \leq p-5$. Hence $vx_{m-1} \in D$. From $A(x_m,\{u,v\}) = \emptyset$ and $d(x_m) \geq p-1$ we have $d(x_m,\{x_2,x_3,\ldots,x_{m-1}\}) \geq p-3$. Note that x_m cannot be inserted into the path $x_2x_3\ldots x_{m-1}$ (otherwise we obtain a cycle of length m, which does not contain the vertices v and x_1 and therefore, by Claim 2, the subdigraph $\langle\{v,x_1\}\rangle$ is strong, which contradicts the fact that $vx_1 \notin D$). It follows that $x_mx_2 \in D$ by Lemma 2, and $C_{m+1} = x_{m-2}uvx_{m-1}x_mx_2\ldots x_{m-2}$, a contradiction. Claim 7 is proved. $\square$

Similarly to Claim 7, we can show the following:

Claim 8. If $i \in [1,m]$, then $|A(u \to \{x_i,x_{i+1}\})| \leq 1$. $\square$

Claim 9. If $k \in [1,m]$, then $|A(x_k \to u)| + |A(u \to x_{k-1})| \leq 1$.
Proof. Suppose, to the contrary, that is $k \in [1,m]$ and x_ku, $ux_{k-1} \in D$. To be definite, assume that $x_k := x_2$. From Claims 7, 8 and (1) it follows that

$$A(u,\{x_m,x_3\}) = A(x_1 \to u) = A(u \to x_2) = \emptyset.$$

From this it is easy to see that $m \geq 5$ and $d(u, \{x_4, x_5, \ldots, x_{m-1}) \geq p-5$. Since the vertex u cannot be inserted into the path $x_4x_5 \ldots x_{m-1}$, by Lemma 2 we have ux_4 and $x_{m-1}u \in D$. Hence, $|A(v, x_3)| = |A(v, x_m)| = 2$ by Claim 5. Therefore $A(v, \{x_1, x_2\}) = \emptyset$ by Claims 7 and 8. Since $C_{m+1} \not\subset D$ it is not difficult to see that x_mx_2, x_2x_4, x_1x_3 and $x_3x_2 \notin D$ (if $x_3x_2 \in D$, then $C_{m+1} = x_mvx_3x_2ux_4 \ldots x_m$). So we have $d(x_2, \{u, v, x_1, x_3\}) \leq 4$ and $d(x_2, \{x_4, x_5, \ldots, x_m\} \geq p-5$. Therefore, since $x_mx_2 \notin D$ and $x_2x_4 \notin D$, applying Lemma 2(iii), we can insert x_2 into the path $x_4x_5 \ldots x_m$ (i.e., x_ix_2, $x_2x_{i+1} \in D$ for some $i \in [4, m-1]$) and obtain a cycle $x_mvux_4 \ldots x_ix_2x_{i+1} \ldots x_m$ of length m, which does not contain the vertices x_1 and x_3. By Claim 2, the subdigraph $\langle\{x_1, x_3\}\rangle$ is strong. Hence $x_1x_3 \in D$, which contradicts the fact that $x_1x_3 \notin D$. This completes the proof of Claim 9. □

We now divide Case 2 ($h = 0$) into two subcases.

Subcase 2.1. $p = 2n + 1$.

From (1) and Claims 7- 9 it follows that the vertex u (respectively, v) is adjacent with at most one vertex of two consecutive vertices of the cycle C and $O(u, C) = I(u, C)$ and $O(v, C) = I(v, C)$. Hence, without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$A(u, \{x_2, x_3\}) = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad O(u) = I(u) = \{x_1, x_4, x_6, \ldots, x_{p-3}, v\}. \tag{6}$$

If $m = 3$, then Claim 3 implies that $|A(v, x_2)| = 2$ or $|A(v, x_3)| = 2$ and $C_4 \subset D$, a contradiction.

Assume that $m = 2n-1 \geq 5$. Since $x_{m-1}u \in D$, by Claim 5 we have $|A(x_m, v)| = 2$. Therefore, by an argument similar to (6), we get that ether $|A(v, x_2)| = 2$ or $|A(v, x_3)| = 2$. From this and (6) it is easy to see that if $vx_3 \in D$, then $C_{m+1} = x_1uvx_3x_4 \ldots x_mx_1$ and if $x_2v \in D$, then $C_{m+1} = x_2vux_4x_5 \ldots x_mx_1x_2$, a contradiction.

Subcase 2.2. $p = 2n$.

From $d(u) \geq 2n-1$ it follows that ether $od(u) \geq n$ or $id(u) \geq n$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $od(u) \geq n$ (otherwise we will consider the digraph $\overleftarrow{D}$). Now from Claims 7-9 it follows that

$$u \to \{x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{2n-3}\}, \quad A(u, \{x_2, x_4, \ldots, x_{2n-2}\}) = \emptyset, \tag{7}$$

$$I(u) \subseteq \{v, x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{2n-3}\}. \tag{8}$$

Since $id(u) \geq n-1$, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\{x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{2n-5}\} \to u$. Hence , by (7) and Claim 5, it follows that for each $i \in [1, n-2]$,

$$|A(u, x_{2i-1})| = |A(v, x_{2i})| = 2. \tag{9}$$

Then by Claims 7-9 we have $A(v, \{x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{2n-3}\}) = \emptyset$. Therefore $A(v, x_{2n-2}) \neq \emptyset$ since $d(v) \geq 2n-1$, i.e. $vx_{2n-2} \in D$ or $v_{2n-2}v \in D$. If $vx_{2n-2} \in D$, then $x_{2n-3}u \in D$ and $x_{2n-2}v \in D$ by Claim 5, (8) and (9). So, in any case we have that $x_{2n-2}v \in D$. Then $id(v) \geq n$.

We will now show that

$$A(\langle\{x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{2n-3}\}\rangle) = \emptyset. \tag{10}$$

Proof of (10). Assume that (10) is not true. Then $x_ix_j \in D$ for some distinct vertices $x_i, x_j \in \{x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{2n-3}\}$. Assume that $|\{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \ldots, x_{j-1}\}| = 1$. Then from (9) and $x_{2n-2}v \in D$ we have: a) if $j = 2n-3$, then $i = 2n-5$ and $C_{m+1} = x_{2n-5}x_{2n-3}x_{2n-2}vux_1x_2 \ldots x_{2n-5}$; b) if $j \neq 2n-3$, then $C_{m+1} = x_ix_juvx_{j+1} \ldots x_{i-1}x_i$. Now assume that $|\{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \ldots, x_{j-1}\}| \geq 2$. Then $n \geq 6$. Using (9) we can see that: c) if $i \neq 2n-3$ and $j \neq 1$, then $C_{m+1} = x_ix_jx_{j+1} \ldots x_{i-1}vx_{i+1} \ldots x_{j-2}ux_i$; d) if $i = 2n-3$ or $j = 1$, then $C_{m+1} = x_ix_jx_{j+1} \ldots x_{i-2}ux_{i+2} \ldots x_{j-1}vx_{i-1}x_i$. Hence in each case we have a $C_{m+1} \subset D$, which is a contradiction and (10) is proved. $\square$

Using an analogous argument for $\overleftarrow{D}$, similarly to (10), we can show that $A(\langle\{x_2, x_4, \ldots, x_{2n-2}\}\rangle) = \emptyset$. Therefore

$$A(\langle\{v, x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{2n-3}\}\rangle) = A(\langle\{u, x_2, x_4, \ldots, x_{2n-2}\}\rangle) = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad D \subseteq K^*_{n,n}.$$

This contradicts the our supposition. The discussion of Case 2 is completed and Theorem 1 is proved. $\square$

3. A sufficient condition for a digraph to be hamiltonian

Theorem 2. Let D be a digraph on $2n \geq 6$ vertices with minimum degree at least $2n-1$ and with minimum semi-degree at least $n-1$. Then D is hamiltonian unless

$$D \in H(n,n) \cup H(n,n-1,1) \cup \{H(2n), H'(2n), D_6, D'_6, \overleftarrow{D}_6, \overleftarrow{D'_6}\}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4(i), the result is easily verified if D is not strong. Now assume that D is strong. The proof is by contradiction. Suppose that Theorem 2 is false, in particular, D is not hamiltonian. Then it is not difficult to see that $D \not\subseteq K^*_{n,n}$. By Theorem 1, D has a cycle of length $2n-1$. Let $C := C_{2n-1} := x_1 x_2 \ldots x_{2n-1} x_1$ be an arbitrary cycle of length $2n-1$ in D and let the vertex x is not containing this cycle C. Since C is a longest cycle, using Lemmas 1 and 2, we obtain the following claim:

Claim 1. (i) $d(x) = 2n-1$ and there is a vertex x_l, $l \in [1, 2n-1]$ such that $A(x, x_l) = \emptyset$.

(ii) If $x_i x \notin D$, then $x x_{i+1} \in D$ and if $x x_i \notin D$, then $x_{i-1} x \in D$, where $i \in [1, 2n-1]$.

(iii) If $A(x, x_i) = \emptyset$, then $x_{i-1}x$, $x x_{i+1} \in D$ and $d(x_i) = 2n-1$. $\square$

By Claim 1(i), without loss of generality, we may assume that $A(x, x_{2n-1}) = \emptyset$. For convenience, let $p := 2n-2$ and $y := x_{2n-1}$. We have $y x_1$, $x_p y \in D$ and $x_p x$, $x x_1 \in D$ by Claim 1(iii), and $d(y) = 2n-1$ by Claim 1(i).

Let $\{u, v\} := \{x, y\}$ and for each $z \in \{x, y\}$ let

$$O^-(z) := \{x_i / z x_{i+1} \in D,\ i \in [1, p-2]\}, \quad I^+(z) := \{x_i / x_{i-1} z \in D,\ i \in [2, p-1]\}.$$

We first prove the following Claims 2-11.

Claim 2. If $x_{p-1} u \in D$, then $A(O^-(v) \to x_p) = \emptyset$.
Proof. Assume, to the contrary, that $x_{p-1} u \in D$ and $x_i x_p \in D$, where $x_i \in O^-(v)$. Then by the definition of $O^-(v)$, $v x_{i+1} \in D$ and $x_1 x_2 \ldots x_i x_p v x_{i+1} \ldots x_{p-1} u x_1$ is a hamiltonian cycle, a contradiction. $\square$

Claim 3. If $x_{p-1} u$, $v x_p \in D$, then $A(x_p \to I^+(v)) = \emptyset$.
Proof. Assume, to the contrary, that $x_{p-1} u$, $v x_p$ and $x_p x_i \in D$, where $x_i \in I^+(v)$. Then by the definition of $I^+(v)$, $x_{i-1} v \in D$ and $x_1 x_2 \ldots x_{i-1} v x_p\, x_i \ldots x_{p-1} u x_1$ is a hamiltonian cycle, a contradiction. $\square$

Claim 4. If $x_{p-1} \to \{x, y\}$, then $od(x) = od(y) = n-1$, $id(x) = id(y) = n$ and $O(x) = O(y)$.
Proof. Let $x_{p-1} \to \{x, y\}$. Since C is longest cycle of D, we have $A(\{x, y\} \to x_p) = \emptyset$. By Claim 2, $A(O^-(x) \cup O^-(y) \to x_p) = \emptyset$. Hence, $|O^-(x) \cup I^-(y) \cup \{x, y\}| \leq n$ by Lemma 4(ii). Therefore, since $|O^-(u)| = od(u) - 1$, we deduce that $od(x) = od(y) = n-1$ and $O(x) = O(y)$. Together with $d(x) = d(y) = 2n-1$ this implies that $id(x) = id(y) = n$. Claim 4 is proved. $\square$

Similarly to Claim 4, we can show the following claim:

Claim 5. If $\{x,y\} \to x_2$, then $id(x) = id(y) = n-1$, $od(x) = od(y) = n$ and $I(x) = I(y)$. □

Claim 6. $|A(x_{p-1} \to \{x,y\})| \le 1$.
Proof. Assume, on the contrary, that $x_{p-1} \to \{x,y\}$. Then $id(x) = id(y) = n$, $od(x) = od(y) = n-1$ and $O(x) = O(y)$ by Claim 4. Hence, $xx_2 \in D$ if and only if $yx_2 \in D$. Therefore, $A(\{x,y\} \to x_2) = \emptyset$ by Claim 5. Hence, $x_1 \to \{x,y\}$ by Claim 1(ii). Together with $od(x) \ge 2$ this implies that there exists an $k \in [2, p-2]$ such that $x_{k-1}x$, $xx_{k+1} \in D$ and $A(x, x_k) = \emptyset$. Applying Claim 1(iii) we find that $d(x_k) = 2n-1$. From $O(x) = O(y)$ it is not difficult to see that $A(x_k, y) = \emptyset$, yx_{k+1}, $x_{k-1}y \in D$. Then by Lemma 2, since x_k cannot be inserted into the path $x_1x_2\dots x_{k-1}$ and into the path $x_{k+1}x_{k+2}\dots x_p$, we have

$$d(x_k, \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}\}) \le k \quad \text{and} \quad d(x_k, \{x_{k+1}, x_{k+2}, \dots, x_p\}) \le p-k+1.$$

Using this, $d(x_k) = p+1$, $A(x_k, \{x,y\}) = \emptyset$ and Lemma 2(ii), we obtain

$$x_kx_1, x_px_k \in D \quad \text{and} \quad d(x_k, \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}\}) = k,\ d(x_k, \{x_{k+1}, x_{k+2}, \dots, x_p\}) = p-k+1. \tag{11}$$

We now show that

$$A(\{x,y\} \to x_{k+2}) = \emptyset. \tag{12}$$

Proof of (12). Suppose that (12) is false. From $O(x) = O(y)$ it is clear that $\{x,y\} \to x_{k+2}$. Since $x_kx_1 \in D$ we see that $x_{k+1}x_k \notin D$ (otherwise $x_{k+1}x_k \in D$ and $x_1x_2\dots x_{k-1}xx_{k+2}\dots x_pyx_{k+1}x_kx_1$ is a hamiltonian cycle, a contradiction). Note that $x_1x_2\dots x_{k-1}xx_{k+1}\dots x_pyx_1$ is a cycle of length $2n-1$ and the vertex x_k cannot be inserted into this cycle. Then, since $x_{k+1}x_k \notin D$ and $d(x_k) = 2n-1$, using Claim 1(ii) we get $x_kx_{k+2} \in D$. From this it follows that $\{x, x_k\} \to \{x_{k+1}, x_{k+2}\}$ and $x_{k-1} \to \{x, x_k\}$ for the path $x_{k+1}x_{k+2}\dots x_pyx_1x_2\dots x_{k-1}$. Therefore $id(x) = n-1$ by Claim 5, which contradicts the fact that $id(x) = n$. This proves (12). □

From $x_1 \to \{x,y\}$ and (12) it follows that $|A(x \to \{x_i, x_{i+1}\})| \le 1$ for each $i \in [1, p-2]$. Therefore, since $od(y) = od(x) = n-1$ and $O(x) = O(y)$, it is not difficult to see that

$$\{x,y\} \to \{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{p-1}\} \to \{x,y\}, \tag{13}$$

$$A(\{x,y\}, \{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{p-2}\}) = \emptyset. \tag{14}$$

Together with Claim 2 this implies that

$$A(\{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{p-2}\} \to x_p) = \emptyset. \tag{15}$$

It is not difficult to show that

$$A(\langle\{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{p-2}\}\rangle) = \emptyset. \tag{16}$$

Indeed, if (16) is false, then $x_ix_j \in D$ for some distinct vertices $x_i, x_j \in \{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{p-2}\}$. It is easy to see that if $i < j$, then $C_{2n} = x_1x_2\dots x_ix_j\dots x_pyx_{i+1}\dots x_{j-1}xx_1$ and if $i > j$, then $x_jx_1 \in D$ by (11), and $C_{2n} = x_1x_2\dots x_{j-1}xx_{i+1}\dots x_pyx_{j+1}\dots x_ix_jx_1$, a contradiction.

From (14) and (16) it follows that $A(\langle\{x, y, x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{2n-4}\}\rangle) = \emptyset$. By (15), now it is not difficult to see that $D \in H(n, n-1, 1)$, where $a := x_p$, $A := \{x, y, x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{2n-4}\}$ and $B := \{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{2n-3}\}$. This contradicts to our supposition that $D \notin H(n, n-1, 1)$. The proof of Claim 6 is completed. □

Similarly to Claim 6, we can show the following claim:

Claim 7. $|A(\{x,y\} \to x_2)| \le 1$. $\square$

Claim 8. There is a vertex x_i, $i \in [2, p-1]$, such that $A(x, x_i) = \emptyset$ (i.e., if C_{2n-1}, $p = 2n-2$, is an arbitrary cycle of D and the vertex $x \notin C_{2n-1}$, then x is not adjacent with at least two vertices).
Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that the vertex x is adjacent with each vertex x_i, $i \in [2, p-1]$. Since $n \ge 3$, $d(x) = p+1$ and D is not hamiltonian, there is an $l \in [2, p-1]$ such that

$$O(x) = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l\} \quad \text{and} \quad I(x) = \{x_l, x_{l+1}, \dots, x_p\}. \tag{17}$$

Since $od(x)$ and $id(x) \ge n-1$, we see that $l = n-1$ or $l = n$. Hence $x_{p-1}y \notin D$ and $yx_2 \notin D$ by Claims 6 and 7. Now x_1y and $yx_p \in D$ by Claim 1(ii). Therefore, since y cannot be inserted into the path $x_1x_2 \dots x_p$, there is a vertex x_k, $k \in [2, p-1]$, such that $A(y, x_k) = \emptyset$. Using Claim 1(iii), we get

$$x_{k-1}y,\ yx_{k+1} \in D \quad \text{and} \quad d(x_k) = p+1. \tag{18}$$

Choose k is as large as possible. It follows that $y \to \{x_{k+1}, x_{k+2}, \dots, x_p\}$ and $k \ge l-1$. We can assume that $k \ge l$ (if $k = l-1$, then in digraph $\overleftarrow{D}$ we will have the case $k \ge l+1$).

Suppose first that $k \ge l+1$. If $x_ix_k \in D$, where $i \in [1, l-1]$, then by (17) and (18), $x_1x_2 \dots x_ix_k \dots x_p xx_{i+1} \dots x_{k-1}yx_1$ is a hamiltonian cycle, a contradiction. So we may assume that $A(\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{l-1}\} \to x_k) = \emptyset$. Using this together with $A(\{x, y\} \to x_k) = \emptyset$, $l \ge n-1$ and $id(x_k) \ge n-1$, we obtain $x_px_k \in D$. Therefore $x_1x_2 \dots x_{k-1}yx_{k+1} \dots x_px_kxx_1$ is a hamiltonian cycle, a contradiction.

Now suppose that $k = l$. Assume, without loss of generality, that $A(x_i, y) \ne \emptyset$ for each $i \in [2, l-1]$ (otherwise in $\overleftarrow{D}$ we will have the considered case $k \ge l+1$). Then from $x_1y \in D$ it follows that

$$\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{l-1}\} \to y. \tag{19}$$

We also can assume that $l = n$ (if $l = n-1$, then in $\overleftarrow{D}$ we will have the case $l = n$). So, we have $k = l = n$. It is not difficult to see that

$$A(x_1, x_n) = A(\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-2}, x_p\} \to x_n) = A(x_n \to \{x_{n+2}, x_{n+3}, \dots, x_{p-1}\}) = \emptyset. \tag{20}$$

Indeed, if it is not true, then by (17) and (19) we have

if $x_ix_n \in D$ and $i \in [1, n-2]$, then $C_{2n} = x_1x_2 \dots x_ix_n \dots x_pxx_{i+1} \dots x_{n-1}yx_1$;

if $x_nx_i \in D$ and $i \in [n+2, p-1]$, then $C_{2n} = x_1x_2 \dots x_nx_ix_{i+1} \dots x_pyx_{n+1} \dots x_{i-1}xx_1$;

if $x_px_n \in D$, then $C_{2n} = x_1x_2 \dots x_{n-1}yx_{n+1} \dots x_px_nxx_1$;

if $x_nx_1 \in D$, then $C_{2n} = x_1x_2 \dots x_{n-1}yx_{n+1} \dots x_pxx_nx_1$. In each case we have a hamiltonian cycle, a contradiction, and (20) holds.

Therefore from $d(x_n) = 2n-1$ and (20), since x_n cannot be inserted into the paths $x_1x_2 \dots x_{n-1}$ and $x_{n+1}x_{n+2} \dots x_p$, it follows that (by Lemma 2)

$$\{x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, \dots, x_{p-1}\} \to x_n \to \{x_2, x_3, \dots, x_{n-1}\}. \tag{21}$$

If $x_ix_1 \in D$ for some $i \in [2, p-1] \backslash \{n\}$, then by (17), (18), (19) and (21) we have if $i \in [2, n-1]$, then $C_{2n} = x_1x_2 \dots x_{i-1}yx_{n+1} \dots x_pxx_{i+1} \dots x_nx_ix_1$ and if $i \in [n+1, p-1]$, then $C_{2n} = x_1x_2 \dots x_{n-1}yx_{i+1} \dots x_pxx_n \dots x_ix_1$, a contradiction. So, we may assume that

$$A(\{x_2, x_3, \dots, x_{p-1}\} \to x_1) = \emptyset. \tag{22}$$

Hence, by Lemma 4(ii), $2n-4 \le n$, i.e. $n \le 4$. Let $n = 4$. Then by (22,) $id(x_1) \le 3$. On the other hand, from $A(x_1 \to \{x, x_3, x_4, x_5\}) = \emptyset$ it follows (if $x_1x_5 \in D$, then $x_4x_2 \in D$ by (21), and $C_8 = x_1x_5x_6xx_3x_4x_2yx_1$) that $od(x_1) \le 3$. So $d(x_1) \le 6$, a contradiction. Let now $n = 3$. From (21) we see that $x_3x_2 \in D$. Hence it is easy to see that $x_4x_3 \notin D$ by (20), $x_4x_2 \notin D$ and

$$A(x_1 \to \{x, x_3, x_4\}) = A(\{x_2, x_3\} \to x_1) = \emptyset.$$

Therefore $x_4x_1 \in D$. Now, it is not difficult to check that D is isomorphic to one of the digraphs D_6, D'_6, a contradiction. This completes the proof of Claim 8. $\square$

Similarly to Claim 8, we can show the following claim:

Claim 9. There is a vertex x_i, $i \in [2, p-1]$, such that $A(y, x_i) = \emptyset$. $\square$

Claim 10. $x_{p-1}y \notin D$.
Proof of claim 10. Suppose, on the contrary, that $x_{p-1}y \in D$. By Claim 6 we have $x_{p-1}x \notin D$. Therefore $xx_p \in D$ by Claim 1(ii) . By Claim 8 there is a vertex x_l, $l \in [2, p-1]$, such that $A(x, x_l) = \emptyset$. Using Claim 1(iii), we obtain

$$x_{l-1}x,\ xx_{l+1} \in D \quad \text{and} \quad d(x_l) = 2n-1 = p+1. \tag{23}$$

For the vertex x_l we first will prove the following statements **(a)-(i)**.

(a). $x_px_l \notin D$.
Proof. Indeed, if **(a)** is not true, then $x_px_l \in D$ and $C_{2n} = x_1x_2 \ldots x_{l-1}xx_px_l \ldots x_{p-1}yx_1$ by (23), a contradiction. $\square$

(b). If $l \leq p-2$, then $A(x_l, x_p) = \emptyset$.
Proof. From $l \leq p-2$ it follows that $x_l \in O^-(x)$. Hence $x_lx_p \notin D$ by Claim 2. Therefore by statement **(a)**, $A(x_l, x_p) = \emptyset$. $\square$

(c). If $l \leq p-2$, then $x_{p-1}x_l$ and $x_ly \in D$.
Proof. Note that $A(x_l, x_p) = \emptyset$ by statement **(b)**, and the cycle $x_1x_2 \ldots x_{l-1}xx_{l+1} \ldots x_pyx_1$ has length $2n-1$. Therefore $x_{p-1}x_l$ and $x_ly \in D$ by Claim 1(iii). $\square$

(d). If $l \leq p-2$, then $A(y \to \{x_l, x_{l+1}, \ldots, x_p\}) \neq \emptyset$.
Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $A(y \to \{x_l, x_{l+1}, \ldots, x_p\}) = \emptyset$. It follows that $O^-(y) \subseteq \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{l-2}\}$. If $x_i \in O^-(y)$ and $x_ix_l \in D$, then $C_{2n} = x_1x_2 \ldots x_ix_l \ldots x_pyx_{i+1} \ldots x_{l-1}xx_1$ is a hamiltonian cycle in D, a contradiction. So we can assume that $A(O^-(y) \to x_l) = \emptyset$. Together with $A(\{x, y\} \to x_l) = \emptyset$ and $|O^-(y)| \geq n-2$ this implies that $x_px_l \in D$. But this contradicts **(a)**, and hence **(d)** is proved. $\square$

(e). If $l \leq p-2$, then $x_px_{l+1} \notin D$ and $x_{l-1}x_p \notin D$.
Proof. Recall that xx_p, $x_px \in D$, and $x_{p-1}x_l$, $x_ly \in D$ by **(c)**. Then by (23) we have, if $x_px_{l+1} \in D$, then $C_{2n} = x_1x_2 \ldots x_{l-1}xx_px_{l+1} \ldots x_{p-1}x_lyx_1$ and if $x_{l-1}x_p \in D$, then $C_{2n} = x_1x_2 \ldots x_{l-1}x_pxx_{l+1} \ldots x_{p-1}x_l\ yx_1$. Therefore D is hamiltonian, a contradiction. $\square$

(f). If $l \leq p-2$ and $xx_{l+2} \in D$, then $x_lx_{l+2} \notin D$ and $x_{l+1}x_l \in D$.
Proof. Indeed, if $x_lx_{l+2} \in D$, then for the path $x_{l+1}x_{l+2} \ldots x_pyx_1x_2 \ldots x_{l-1}$ we have $\{x, x_l\} \to \{x_{l+1}, x_{l+2}\}$ and $x_{l-1} \to \{x, x_l\}$, which contradicts Claim 7. So $x_lx_{l+2} \notin D$. Now from Claim 1(ii) it follows that $x_{l+1}x_l \in D$. $\square$

(g). If $l \geq 3$ and $x_{l-2}x \in D$, then $x_{l-2}x_l \notin D$ and $x_lx_{l-1} \in D$.
Proof. Indeed, if $x_{l-2}x_l \in D$, then for the path $x_{l+1}x_{l+2} \ldots x_pyx_1 \ldots x_{l-2}x_{l-1}$ we have $\{x_{l-2}, x_{l-1}\} \to \{x, x_l\}$ and $\{x, x_l\} \to x_{l+1}$, which contradicts Claim 6. So $x_{l-2}x_l \notin D$. From this and Claim 1(ii) it

follows that $x_lx_{l-1} \in D$. Statement **(g)** is proved. $\square$

(h). If $l \leq p-2$, then $x_ix_p \in D$ if and only if $x_i \notin \{x_{l-1}\} \cup O^-(x)$; and $x_px_i \in D$ if and only if $x_i \notin \{x_{l+1}\} \cup I^+(x)$.
Proof. By Claims 2, 3 and statement **(e)** we have

$$A(O^-(x) \cup \{x_{l-1}, y\} \to x_p) = A(x_p \to \{x_{l+1}\} \cup I^+(x)) = \emptyset. \tag{24}$$

From $x_{p-1}x \notin D$ and $xx_p \in D$, we get that

$$|I^+(x)| = id(x) - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |O^-(x)| = od(x) - 2.$$

Therefore $id(x_p) \leq 2n-1-od(x)$ and $od(x_p) \leq 2n-1-id(x)$ by (24). Hence $id(x_p) = 2n-1-od(x)$ and $od(x_p) = 2n-1-id(x)$ (otherwise $d(x)+d(x_p) < 4n-2$, which is a contradiction). Now from this it is not difficult to see that statement **(h)** is true. $\square$

Recall that the proof of statement **(h)** implies the following statement:

(i). The vertex x is not adjacent with at most one vertex of the path $x_1x_2 \ldots x_{p-2}$, in particular, the vertex x is not adjacent with at most 3 vertices (i.e., if C_{2n-1} is an arbitrary cycle of D and the vertex $x \notin C_{2n-1}$, then x is not adjacent with at most tree vertices). $\square$

By Claim 8 there is a vertex x_k, $k \in [2, p-1]$, such that $A(x, x_k) = \emptyset$. Without loss of generality, assume that k is as large as possible. From the maximality of k and Claim 1(iii) it is easy to see that

$$x_{k-1}x \in D,\, d(x_k) = p+1,\, x \to \{x_{k+1}, x_{k+2}, \ldots, x_p\},\, A(\{x_{k+1}, x_{k+2}, \ldots, x_{p-1}\} \to x) = \emptyset. \tag{25}$$

We now consider two cases.
Case 1. $k \leq p-2$.
Then by statement **(c)** we have

$$x_{p-1}x_k \in D \quad \text{and} \quad x_ky \in D. \tag{26}$$

From statement **(i)** and (25) it follows that if $i \in [1,p]$ and $i \neq k$, then

$$A(x, x_i) \neq \emptyset. \tag{27}$$

It is easy to see that $n \geq 4$. Indeed, if $n = 3$, then $k = 2$ and by (26) the vertex y is not adjacent only with one vertex of the cycle $x_1x_2 \ldots x_pxx_1$, which contradicts Claim 9.

Suppose first that $k \leq p-3$. Then $x_1 \notin I^+(x)$, and $x_{k+2} \notin I^+(x)$ by (25). Together with statement **(h)** this implies that

$$x_p \to \{x_1, x_{k+2}\}. \tag{28}$$

If $x_{k+1}y \in D$, then using (25), (26) and (28), we obtain $C_{2n} = x_1x_2 \ldots x_{k-1}xx_px_{k+2} \ldots x_{p-1}x_kx_{k+1}y$ x_1, a contradiction. So, we may assume that $x_{k+1}y \notin D$. Since $x_ky \in D$ by (26), we see that $A(y, x_{k+1}) = \emptyset$. Therefore $yx_{k+2} \in D$ by Claim 1(iii). Recall that $x_{k+1}x_k \in D$ by statement **(f)**, and hence by (25) and (28) we have a hamiltonian cycle $x_1x_2 \ldots x_{k-1}xx_{k+1}x_kyx_{k+2} \ldots x_px_1$, a contradiction.

Suppose next that $k = p-2$. Then by $x_{p-1}y \in D$ and statements **(d)**, **(c)**, $yx_{p-2} \in D$. If $xx_2 \in D$, then $x_1x \notin D$, $x_2 \notin I^+(x)$ and $x_px_2 \in D$ by statement **(h)**. Since $xx_2 \in D$, by Claim 7 we have $yx_2 \notin D$. Therefore $x_1y \in D$ by Claim 1(ii), and we get a hamiltonian cycle $x_1yx_{p-2}x_{p-1}x_px_2 \ldots x_{p-3}xx_1$, a contradiction. So we may assume that $xx_2 \notin D$. From this and (27) it follows that

$$\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{p-3}\} \to x \quad \text{and} \quad A(x \to \{x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_{p-3}\}) = \emptyset.$$

Therefore $n = 4$ (i.e., $p = 6$). Then $x_4x_3 \in D$ by statement **(g)**. We can assume that $yx_2 \notin D$ (otherwise $yx_2 \in D$ and for $\overleftarrow{D}$ we will have the considered case $k \leq p - 3$). From Claim 1(ii) and $od(y) \geq 3$ it is easy to see that x_1y, $yx_3 \in D$ and $A(y, x_2) = \emptyset$. Since $x_1 \notin I^+(x)$, we have $x_6x_1 \in D$ and $x_6x_2 \notin D$ by statement **(h)**. Then $x_5x_2 \notin D$ (otherwise $x_5x_2 \in D$ and $C_{2n} = x_1yx_4x_5x_2x_3xx_6x_1$). Now we have $A(\{x, y, x_5, x_6\} \to x_2) = \emptyset$. Hence $x_4x_2 \in D$ and $C_{2n} = x_1yx_3x_4x_2xx_5x_6x_1$, a contradiction.

Case 2. $k = p - 1$.

Suppose first that $yx_{p-1} \notin D$. Then it is not difficult to see that $A(O^-(y) \to x_{p-1}) = \emptyset$ (otherwise if $x_i \in O^-(y)$ and $x_ix_{p-1} \in D$, then $C_{2n} = x_1x_2 \ldots x_ix_{p-1}x_pyx_{i+1} \ldots x_{p-2}xx_1$). This together with $|O^-(y)| = od(y) - 1$ and $A(\{x, y, x_p\} \to x_{p-1}) = \emptyset$ implies that $id(x_{p-1}) \leq n - 2$, a contradiction.

Suppose next that $yx_{p-1} \in D$. We assume that $n \geq 5$ (It is tedious, but not difficult to prove the theorem in this case for $n = 3$ and 4. We leave its proof to the reader).

Subcase 2.1. $xx_2 \in D$.

Then $x_1x \notin D$. Using Claims 7 and 1(ii), we obtain $yx_2 \notin D$ and $x_1y \in D$. We may assume that $A(x_2, y) = \emptyset$ (otherwise for the vertex y in digraph $\overleftarrow{D}$ we have the considered Case 1 ($k \leq p - 2$)). Then by Claim 1(iii), $yx_3 \in D$. Similarly to $yx_{p-1} \in D$, we also may assume that $x_2x \in D$. From $n \geq 5$ it follows that $A(x, x_s) = \emptyset$ for some $s \in [3, p - 3]$ (otherwise $O(x) = \{x_1, x_2, x_p\}$, i.e., $od(x) \leq 3$, a contradiction). Since $x_2 \notin \{x_{s+1}\} \cup I^+(x)$, using statement **(h)**, we see that $x_px_2 \in D$ and $x_1yx_3 \ldots x_px_2xx_1$ is a hamiltonian cycle, a contradiction.

Subcase 2.2. $xx_2 \notin D$.

Then $x_1x \in D$ by Claim 1(ii). By statement **(i)**, the vertex x is not adjacent with at most one vertex of $\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{p-3}\}$. From this and $n \geq 5$ it follows that $A(x, x_s) = \emptyset$ exactly for one $s \in [2, p - 4]$ (otherwise $A(x, x_i) \neq \emptyset$ for each $i \in [2, p - 4]$ and by $xx_2 \in D$, $A(x \to \{x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_{p-3}\}) = \emptyset$, i.e. $O(x) \subseteq \{x_1, x_{p-2}, x_p\}$ and $od(x) \leq 3$, which contradicts that $n \geq 5$).

Let $s = 2$ (i.e., $A(x, x_2) = \emptyset$). Note that x_1x, $xx_3 \in D$ by Claim 1(iii). From statement **(c)** it follows that $x_{p-1}x_2$ and $x_2y \in D$. Since $x_1 \notin I^+(x)$, by statement **(h)** we have $x_px_1 \in D$. If $yx_2 \notin D$, then $x_1y \in D$ by Claim 1(ii), and $x_1yx_{p-1}x_2 \ldots x_{p-2}xx_px_1$ is a hamiltonian cycle, a contradiction. So we may assume that $yx_2 \in D$. Also we may assume that $id(x) = n$ (for otherwise we will consider the digraph $\overleftarrow{D}$). Then, since $n \geq 4$, we see that $\{x_{p-3}, x_{p-2}\} \to x$ and by **(g)**, $x_{p-1}x_{p-2} \in D$. Then $x_{p-3} \notin O^-(x) \cup \{x_1\}$ and by **(h)** ($l = 2$) we see that $x_{p-3}x_p \in D$. Thus $x_1x_2 \ldots x_{p-3}x_pyx_{p-1}x_{p-2}xx_1$ is a hamiltonian cycle, a contradiction.

Let now $s \in [3, p - 4]$. Then from $x_1x \in D$ it follows that $\{x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_{s-1}\} \to x$. Together with statement **(i)** this implies that

$$\{x_{s-2}, x_{s-1}\} \to x \to \{x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}\}.$$

By statements **(f)** and **(g)** we have $x_{s+1}x_s,\ x_sx_{s-1} \in D,\ x_sx_{s+2} \notin D$ and $x_{s-2}x_s \notin D$.

It is not difficult to show that

$$A(x_s, \{x_{s-2}, x_{s+2}\}) = \emptyset. \tag{29}$$

Indeed, if $x_sx_{s-2} \in D$, then, since $\{x_{s-2}, x_{s-1}\} \to x$, for the path $x_{s+1}x_{s+2} \ldots x_pyx_1x_2 \ldots x_{s-1}$ and for the vertex x_s we will have the considered Case 1, and if $x_{s+2}x_s \in D$, then in digraph $\overleftarrow{D}$ for the path $x_{s-1}x_{s-2} \ldots x_1yx_px_{p-1} \ldots x_{s+2}x_{s+1}$ and for the vertex x_s again we will have the considered Case 1 ($k \leq p - 2$) and (29) holds.

Recall that $A(x_s, x_p) = \emptyset$ by statement **(b)**. Together with (29) and $A(x_s, x) = \emptyset$ this implies that

$$A(x_s, \{x, x_p, x_{s-2}, x_{s+2}\} = \emptyset,$$

i.e., the vertex x_s is not adjacent with at least 4 vertices of cycle $x_1x_2 \ldots x_{s-1}xx_{s+1} \ldots x_pyx_1$, this is contrary to statement **(i)**. The proof of Claim 10 is completed. $\square$

Similarly to Claim 10 ($x_{p-1}y \notin D$), we can show the following claim:

Claim 11. $x_{p-1}x \notin (G)$, $xx_2 \notin D$ and $yx_2 \notin D$. $\square$

Now let us complete the proof of Theorem 2. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $od(x) = n$. It follows that $x \to \{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$ for some $i \in [1, p-1]$. Using Claims 10, 11 and 1(ii) we see that $i \geq 3$ and $x_1 \to \{x, y\}$. Therefore $A(x, x_l) = \emptyset$, $x \to \{x_{l+1}, x_{l+2}\}$ and $x_{l-1}x \in D$ for some $l \in [2, i-1]$. So, for the path $x_{l+1}x_{l+2} \ldots x_pyx_1 \ldots x_{l-1}$ we have $A(x, x_l) = \emptyset$, $x \to \{x_{l+1}, x_{l+2}\}$ and $x_{l-1}x_l$, x_lx_{l+1}, $x_{l-1}x \in D$. This is a contradiction to Claim 11 ($xx_2 \notin D$) that $xx_{l+2} \notin D$. The proof of Theorem 2 is completed. $\square$

4. Cycles of length 3 and 4 in digraph D.

The next two results will be used in the proof of Theorem 3.

Theorem A (R. Häggkvist, R. J. Faudree, R.H. Schelp [20]). Let G be an undirected graph on $2n+1 \geq 7$ vertices with minimum degree at least n. Then precisely one of the following hold: (i) G is pancyclic; (ii) $G \equiv (K_n \cup K_n) + K_1$; or (iii) $K_{n,n+1} \subseteq G \subseteq K_n + \overline{K}_{n+1}$. $\square$

Theorem B (C. Tomassen [30]). Let D be a strongly connected digraph on $p \geq 3$ vertices. If for each pair x, y of nonadjacent distinct vertices $d(x) + d(y) \geq 2p$, then D is pancyclic or p is even and $D \equiv K^*_{p/2,p/2}$. $\square$

Now we difine the digraphs $C^*_6(1)$, H'_6 and H''_6 as folllows:

(i) $V(C^*_6(1)) = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_6\}$ and $A(C^*_6(1)) = \{x_ix_{i+1}, x_{i+1}x_i / i \in [1, 5]\} \cup \{x_1x_6, x_6x_1, x_1x_3, x_1x_5, x_2x_4, x_6x_4\}$;

(ii) $V(H'_6) = V(H''_6) = \{x, y, z, u, v, w\}$, $A(H'_6) = \{ux, xu, xv, vx, yz, zy, zw, wz, xw, xy, uz, vz, wu, wv, yu, yv\}$ and $A(H''_6) = \{ux, xu, xw, xy, vx, vz, vw, wv, wu, zw, zy, yz, uz, yu, yv\}$.

Theorem 3. Let D be a digraph on $p \geq 5$ vertices with minimum degree at least $p-1$ and with minimum semi-degree at least $p/2 - 1$. Then the following hold:

(i) D contains a cycle of length 3 or $p = 2n$ and $D \subseteq K^*_{n,n}$ or else $D \in \{C^*_5, K^*_{n,n+1}\}$;

(ii) D contains a cycle of length 4 or $D \in \{C^*_5, H'_6, H''_6, C^*_6(1), H(3,3), [(K_2 \cup K_2) + K_1]^*\}$.

Proof. Using Theorems A and B, we see that Theorem 3 is true if D is a symmetric digraph. Suppose that D is not symmetric digraph. If D contains no cycle of length 3, then it is not difficult to show that $p = 2n$ and $D \subseteq K^*_{n,n}$ (we leave the details to the reader).

Assume that D contains no cycle of length 4. For each arc $xy \in D$ put

$$S(x, y) := I(x) \cap O(y) \quad \text{and} \quad E(x, y) := V(D) \setminus (O(y) \cup I(x) \cup \{x, y\}).$$

Since D has no cycle of length 4, we see that

$$A(O(y) \setminus \{x\} \to I(x) \setminus \{y\}) = \emptyset. \tag{30}$$

Let us consider the following cases.

Case 1. There is an arc $xy \in D$ such that $yx \notin D$ and $od(y) \geq n$ or $id(x) \geq n$, where $n := \lfloor p/2 \rfloor$.

Without loss of generality, we can assume that $od(y) \geq n$ (if $id(x) \geq n$, then we will consider the digraph $\overleftarrow{D}$). Then from (30) and Lemma 4(ii) it follows that

$$I(x) \subseteq O(y), \quad I(x) = S(x,y) \quad \text{and} \quad A(\langle S(x,y) \rangle) = \emptyset. \tag{31}$$

We now shall prove that

$$I(x) = O(y). \tag{32}$$

Proof of (32). Assume that (32) is not true. Then $O(y) \setminus I(x) \neq \emptyset$ by (31), and let $z \in O(y) \setminus I(x)$. By (30), $A(z \to \{x\} \cup I(x)) = \emptyset$. From this and Lemma 4(ii) it follows that $|\{x\} \cup I(x)| = p/2$, $p = 2n \geq 6$, $id(x) = n - 1$ and

$$z \to V(D) \setminus (\{x, z\} \cup I(x)), \tag{33}$$

in particular, $zy \in D$, $od(z) = n - 1$ and $id(z) \geq n$. If $xz \in D$, then $C_4 = xzyux$, where $u \in S(x,y)$, contradicting the our assumption. Therefore $xz \notin D$. From $id(x) = n - 1$, $id(z) \geq n$ and Lemma 4(ii) it follows that $uz \in D$ for some vertex $u \in I(x)$. Now it is not difficult to see that $O(y) \setminus I(x) = \{z\}$, $E(x,y) \neq \emptyset$ and $A(E(x,y) \to y) = \emptyset$.

Suppose first that for each vertex $v \in I(x)$ there is a vertex $v_1 \in E(x,y)$ such that $v_1 v \in D$. Hence $A(I(x) \to y) = \emptyset$ by (33) and $C_4 \not\subset D$. Therefore $A(I(x) \cup E(x,y) \to y) = \emptyset$, $|E(x,y)| = 1$ and $n = 3$. Let $E(x,y) := \{w\}$ and $I(x) := \{u, v\}$. Note that $w \to \{u, v\}$. Now it is not difficult to see that if $wz \in D$, then $D \equiv H_6^{'}$ and if $wz \notin D$, then $D \equiv H_6^{''}$.

Suppose next that $A(E(x,y) \to v) = \emptyset$ for some $v \in I(x)$. Then $|E(x,y)| = 1$ by (31) and $n = 3$, $xv \in D$, $vy \notin D$ and $v \to \{z, w\}$, where $w \in E(x,y)$. Now it is easy to see that $O(w) = \{z\}$. Therefore $od(w) \leq 1$, a contradiction. This proves (32), i.e., $I(x) = O(y) = S(x,y)$.

Subcase 1.1. $A(x \to S(x,y)) \neq \emptyset$.

Let $xu \in A(x \to S(x,y))$. If $uy \in D$, then $C_4 = xuyu_1x$, where $u_1 \in S(x,y) \setminus \{u\}$, a contradiction. So we may assume that $uy \notin D$. From $od(y) \geq n$, (32) and (31) we get that $u \to E(x,y)$ and $od(y) = n$. It is not difficult to see that $A(E(x,y) \to (S(x,y) \setminus \{u\})) = \emptyset$ (otherwise $C_4 \subset D$). Then $E(x,y) := \{w\}$, $wu, wy \in D$ since $wx \notin D$, and $xv \in D$, where $v \in S(x,y) \setminus \{u\}$. Then $vy \in D$ or $vw \in D$. In both case we obtain a cycle of length 4, which is a contradiction.

Subcase 1.2. $A(x \to S(x,y)) = \emptyset$.

We can assume that $A(S(x,y) \to y) = \emptyset$ (otherwise in $\overleftarrow{D}$ we will have Subcase 1.1). From $od(y) \geq n$, by (32) and Lemma 4(ii) we have $E(x,y) \neq \emptyset$ and $x \to E(x,y) \to y$. Therefore $C_4 = xzyux$, where $z \in E(x,y)$ and $u \in S(x,y)$, which is a contradiction and completes the discussion of Case 1.

Case 2. For each arc $xy \in D$ if $yx \notin D$, then $od(y) < n$ and $id(x) < n$.

From conditions of theorem it follows easily that $od(y) = id(x) = n - 1$ and $p = 2n \geq 6$. If $S(x,y) = \emptyset$, then using (30) and Lemma 4 (ii) it is easy to see that $C_4 \subset D$ or $D \in H(3,3)$. Assume that $S(x,y) \neq \emptyset$. Since $id(y)$ and $od(x) \geq n$, we can assume that $O(y) \to y$ and $x \to I(x)$ (otherwise for some arc ux or yv we have the considered Case 1). Hence it is easy to see that $|S(x,y)| = 1$, $I(x) \neq O(y)$ and $|E(x,y)| = 1$. Let $E(x,y) := \{w\}$ and $S(x,y) := \{z\}$. From (30) it follows that $O(y) \setminus \{z\} \to w \to I(x) \setminus \{z\}$. From this, we obtain $A(z, w) = \emptyset$ since $C_4 \not\subset D$. Now it is not difficult to see that for some $v \in I(x) - \{z\}$ (or $u \in O(y) - \{z\}$) $vz \in D$ (or $zu \in D$). Without loss of generality we may assume that $zu \in D$. From this we have $A(I(x) \setminus \{z\} \to z) = \emptyset$, $wy \notin D$ and $n = 3$. Hence $wu, vw, xw, vu \in D$ and $D \equiv C_6^*(1)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3. □

In [13], we proved the following:

Theorem. Let D be a digraph on $p \geq 10$ vertices with minimum degree at least $p-1$ and with minimum semi-degree at least $p/2-1$ ($n := \lfloor p/2 \rfloor$). Then D is pancyclic unless

$$p = 2n+1 \quad \text{and} \quad K^*_{n,n+1} \subseteq D \subseteq (K_n + \overline{K}_{n+1})^* \quad \text{or} \quad p = 2n \quad \text{and} \quad G \subseteq K^*_{n,n}$$

or else

$$D \in H(n,n) \cup H(n,n-1,1) \cup \{[(K_n \cup K_n) + K_1]^*, H(2n), H'(2n)\}.$$

References

[1] J. Bang-Jensen, G. Gutin, Digraphs: Theory, Algorithms and Applications, Springer, 2000.

[2] J. Bang-Jensen, G. Gutin, H. Li, Sufficient conditions for a digraph to be hamiltonian, J. Graph Theory 22 (2) (1996) 181-187.

[3] J. Bang-Jensen, Y. Guo, A. Yeo, A new sufficient condition for a digraph to be Hamiltonian, Discrete Applied Math. 95 (1999) 61-72.

[4] J. Bang-Jensen, Y. Guo, A note on vertex pancyclic oriented graphs, J. Graph Theory 31 (1999) 313-318.

[5] A. Benhocine, Pancyclism and Meyniel's conditions, Discrete Math. 58 (1986) 113-120.

[6] J. A. Bondy, C. Thomassen, A short proof of Meyniel's theorem, Discrete Math. 19 (1977) 195-197.

[7] D. Christofides, P. Keevash, D. Kühn, D. Osthus, A semi-exact degree condition for Hamilton cycles in digraphs, submitted for publication.

[8] S. Kh. Darbinyan, Pancyclic and panconnected digraphs, Ph. D. Thesis, Institute Mathematici Akad. Navuk BSSR, Minsk, 1981 (in Russian).

[9] S. Kh. Darbinyan, Cycles of any length in digraphs with large semidegrees, Akad. Nauk Armyan. SSR Dokl. 75 (4) (1982) 147-152 (in Russian).

[10] S. Kh. Darbinyan, Pancyclicity of digraphs with the Meyniel condition, Studia Sci. Math. Hungar., 20 (1-4) (1985) 95-117 (in Russian).

[11] S. Kh. Darbinyan, Pancyclicity of digraphs with large semidegrees, Akad. Nauk Armyan. SSR Dokl. 80 (2) (1985) 51-54 (see also in Math. Problems in Computer Science 14 (1985) 55-74) (in Russian).

[12] S. Kh. Darbinyan, A sufficient condition for the Hamiltonian property of digraphs with large semidegrees, Akad. Nauk Armyan. SSR Dokl. 82 (1) (1986) 6-8 (in Russian).

[13] S. Kh. Darbinyan, On the pancyclicity of digraphs with large semidegrees, Akad. Nauk Armyan. SSR Dokl. 83 (3) (1986) 99-101 (in Russian).

[14] S. Kh. Darbinyan, A sufficient condition for digraphs to be Hamiltonian, Akad. Nauk Armyan. SSR Dokl. 91 (2) (1990) 57-59 (in Russian).

[15] S. Kh. Darbinyan, I. A. Karapetyan, On vertex pancyclicity oriented graphs, CSIT Conference, Yerevan, Armenia (2005) 154-155 (see also in Math. Problems in Computer Science, 29 (2007) 66-84) (in Russian).

[16] S. Kh. Darbinyan, I. A. Karapetyan, On the large cycles through any given vertex in oriented graphs, CSIT Conference, Yerevan, Armenia (2007) 77-78 (see also in Math. Problems in Computer Science, 31 (2008) 90-107 (in Russian)).

[17] S. Kh. Darbinyan, K. M. Mosesyan, On pancyclic regular oriented graphs, Akad. Nauk Armyan SSR Dokl. 67 (4) (1978) 208-211 (in Russian).

[18] A. Ghouila-Houri, Une condition suffisante d'existence d'un circuit hamiltonien, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. A-B 251 (1960) 495-497.

[19] G. Gutin, Characterizations of vertex pancyclic and pancyclic ordinary complete multipartie digraphs, Discrete Math., 141 (1-3) (1995) 153-162.

[20] R. Häggkvist, R. J. Faudree, R. H. Schelp, Pancyclic graphs-connected Ramsey number, Ars Combinatoria 11 (1981) 37-49.

[21] R. Häggkvist, C. Thomassen, On pancyclic digraphs, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 20 (1976) 20-40.

[22] B. Jackson, Long paths and cycles in oriented graphs, J. Graph Theory 5 (2) (1981) 145-157.

[23] P. Keevash, D. Kühn, D. Osthus, An exact minimum degree condition for Hamilton cycles in oriented graphs, J. London Math. Soc. 79 (2009) 144-166.

[24] L. Kelly, D. Kühn, D. Osthus, Cycles of given length in oriented graphs, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 100 (2010) 251-264.

[25] D. Kühn, D. Osthus, A. Treglown, Hamiltonan degree sequences in digraphs, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 100 (2010) 367-380.

[26] M. Meyniel, Une condition suffisante d'existence d'un circuit hamiltonien dans un graphe oriente, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 14 (1973) 137-147.

[27] C. St. J. A. Nash-Williams, Hamilton circuits in graphs and digraphs, in: The Many Facets of Graph Theory, Springer- Verlag Lecture Notes, vol. 110, Springer Verlag (1969) 237-243.

[28] M. Overbeck-Larisch, A theorem on pancyclic-oriented graphs, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 23 (2-3) (1977) 168-173.

[29] Z. M. Song, Pancyclic oriented graphs, J. Graph Theory 18 (5) (1994) 461-468.

[30] C. Thomassen, An Ore-type condition implying a digraph to be pancyclic, Discrete Math. 19 (1) (1977) 85-92.

[31] C. Thomassen, Long cycles in digraphs, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 42 (1981) 231-251.

[32] D. R. Woodall, Sufficient conditions for circuits in graphs, Proc. London Math. Soc. 24 (1972) 739-755.

[33] C. Q. Zhang, Arc-disjoint circuits in digraphs, Discrete Math. 41 (1982) 79-96.